



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,938	03/15/2004	G. Glenn Henry	CNTR.2072	1288
23660 7590 08/19/2008 HUFFMAN LAW GROUP, P.C. 1900 MESA AVE. COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80906				
EXAMINER				
LANIER, BENJAMINE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2132				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/19/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO@HUFFMANLAW.NET

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/800,938

**Applicant(s)**

HENRY ET AL.

**Examiner**

BENJAMIN E. LANIER

**Art Unit**

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment filed 08 July 2008 amends claims 1, 16, and 21 are amended. Applicant's amendment is fully considered and entered.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's argument with regards to the objection to claim 15 is not persuasive because claim 15 as amended on 04 February 2008 does not match claim 15 as presently identified as being "Previously Presented". Currently claim 15 recites, "wherein said cryptography unit executes said plurality of cryptographic rounds on each of a plurality of input text blocks to generate a corresponding each of a plurality of output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic rounds are prescribed by a control word that is provided to said cryptography unit." While claim 15 as it was amended on 04 February 2008 recited, "wherein said cryptography unit executes said plurality of cryptographic rounds on each of a plurality of input text blocks to generate a corresponding each of a plurality of output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic rounds are prescribed by a control word that is provided to said cryptography unit, execution logic comprises: of a plurality of output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic cryptography unit." Clearly these two claims are not the same, and present claim 15 has not been identified as being amended. Therefore, the amendments made to claim 15 on 04 February 2008 were not properly identified. Clarification is requested.
3. Applicant's attempt to correlate the definition of a microprocessor to fruit is completely off base and irrelevant to the issues.

4. Applicant repeatedly makes the argument that a co-processor cannot be considered a “microprocessor”, however, Applicant admits on page 14 of the remarks that a co-processor is in fact a “microprocessor”. Applicant states, “it is readily concurred with by those in the art that a ‘coprocessor’ is a *‘limited microprocessor’*”. Applicant clearly recognizes the fact that a co-process is equivalent to a microprocessor.

5. Applicant argues, “a coprocessor only executes threads, or single instructions, or single tasks, handed off by a host microprocessor...a microprocessor (i.e. CPU) executes application programs.” While the examiner rejects the contention that a co-processor “only executes threads, or single instructions”, the examiner has provided a new ground of rejection to address the amended claim language. Colavin (US Publication 2004/0103263) shows a host/co-processor configuration where the co-processor performs execution of application programs.

6. Examiner notes that definitions from Wikipedia.com will not be considered evidence since Wikipedia.com is not a reliable source of information.

7. Applicant argues that the motivation to combine Kessler and Miller is “ludicrous and unfounded. Such an observation that the functionality of literally hundreds of extant instructions be added to a specialized encryption coprocessor that only possesses a few primitive functions such as Kessler’s is not a reasonable conclusion to make whatsoever.” This argument is not persuasive because Applicant has failed to provide any evidence that the coprocessor of Kessler “possesses a few primitive functions”. Applicant’s contention amounts to mere conclusory statements based on personal opinion. Applicant’s conclusion that the proposed modification is “ludicrous and unfounded” is not based on any actual technical evidence.

***Claim Objections***

8. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is believed that portions deleted from the claim were done so unintentionally. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler, U.S. Patent No. 6,789,147, in view of Colavin, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0103263, and further in view of Miller, U.S. Patent No. 6,081,884. Referring to claims 1, 21, Kessler discloses a co-processor that includes multiple execution units (Figure 2) wherein each of the execution units includes an execution queue to store cryptographic instructions received by the co-processor (Figure 8), which meets the limitation of fetch logic, disposed within a microprocessor, configured to receive a cryptographic instruction as a part of an instruction flow executing on said microprocessor, wherein said cryptographic instruction prescribes one of the cryptographic operations. The execution units include a plurality of operation blocks that correspond to

different cryptographic operations that are used depending upon the type of instruction received in the execution queue (Figure 8 & Col. 9, lines 7-43), which meets the limitation of wherein said cryptographic instruction prescribes one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms, algorithm logic, disposed within said microprocessor and operatively coupled to said cryptographic instruction, configured to direct said microprocessor to execute said one of the cryptographic operations according to said one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms. Using the appropriate operation block, the corresponding cryptographic algorithm is used when processing the received instruction (Col. 9, lines 28-43), which meets the limitation of execution logic, disposed within said microprocessor and operatively coupled to said algorithm logic, configured to execute said one of the cryptographic operations. The operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES, 3DES, DES, and RC4 (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of executing a plurality of cryptographic rounds required to complete said one of the cryptographic operations. Kessler does not specify that the co-processor executes that program that includes the cryptographic operations. Colavin discloses a host and co-processor configuration wherein the co-processor executes the actual application program (Abstract & [0018]), which meets the limitation of said cryptographic instruction is one of the instructions in an application program, wherein said application is executed by said microprocessor to obtain expected results. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the co-processor of Kessler to execute the actual application program as described by Colavin in order to efficiently execute programs with high instruction level parallelism as taught by Colavin ([0002]). Kessler does not specify that the co-processor utilizes the x86 instruction set. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made for the co-processor described in Kessler to implement the x86 instruction set because the x86 instruction set has been widely accepted because of its compatibility with a large amount of software as taught by Miller (Col. 2, lines 9-14). Applicant's specification shows that integer instructions are inherent to the x86 instruction set (Page 27). Therefore, when implementing the x86 instruction set in the co-processor of Kessler, as previously described, the execution units would effectively operate as a "integer unit" as claimed.

Referring to claims 2, 3, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES, 3DES, DES, and RC4 (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of an encryption operation, said encryption operation comprises encryption of a plurality of plaintext blocks to generate a corresponding plurality of ciphertext blocks, a decryption operation, said decryption operation comprising decryption of a plurality of ciphertext blocks to generate a corresponding plurality of plaintext blocks.

Referring to claims 4, 22, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms comprises the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) algorithm.

Referring to claims 5, 23, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as DES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms comprises the Digital Encryption Standard (DES) algorithm.

Referring to claims 6, 24, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as 3DES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms comprises the Triple-DES algorithm.

Referring to claims 7, 20, 25, Kessler does not specify that the co-processor utilizes the x86 instruction set. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the co-processor described in Kessler to implement the x86 instruction set because the x86 instruction set has been widely accepted because of its compatibility with a large amount of software as taught by Miller (Col. 2, lines 9-14).

Referring to claims 8, 9, Kessler discloses that each execution unit includes a register file block that includes that data to be operated on by the corresponding cryptographic algorithm (Figure 8 & Co. 9, lines 18-40), which meets the limitation of said cryptographic instruction implicitly references a plurality of registers within said microprocessor, a first register, wherein contents of said first register comprise a first pointer to a first memory address, said first memory address specifying a first location in memory for access of said plurality of input text blocks upon which said one of the cryptographic operations is to be accomplished.

Referring to claim 10, Kessler discloses that each execution unit includes a register file block that includes that data to be operated on by the corresponding cryptographic algorithm (Figure 8 & Co. 9, lines 18-40), which meets the limitation of a second register, wherein contents of said second register comprise a second pointer to a second memory address, said second memory address specifying a second location in said memory for storage of a corresponding plurality of output text blocks, said corresponding plurality of output text blocks being generated



as a result of accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations upon a plurality of input text blocks.

Referring to claim 11, Kessler discloses that each execution unit includes a register file block that includes that data to be operated on by the corresponding cryptographic algorithm (Figure 8 & Co. 9, lines 18-40), which meets the limitation of a third register, wherein contents of said third register indicate a number of text blocks within a plurality of input text blocks.

Referring to claim 12, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES, 3DES, DES, and RC4 (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of a fourth register, wherein contents of said fourth register comprise a third pointer to a third memory address, said third memory address specifying a third location in memory for access of cryptographic key data for use in accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations.

Referring to claim 13, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as RC4 (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of a fifth register, wherein contents of said fifth register comprises a fourth pointer to a fourth memory address, said fourth memory address specifying a fourth location in memory, said fourth location comprising said initialization vector location, contents of said initialization vector comprising an initialization vector or initialization vector equivalent for use in accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations.

Referring to claim 14, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES, 3DES, DES, and RC4 (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of a sixth register, wherein contents of said sixth register comprises a fifth pointer to a

fifth memory address, said fifth memory address specifying a fifth location in memory for access of a control word for use in accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations, wherein said control word prescribes cryptographic parameters for said one of the cryptographic operations because Applicant's specification essentially states that the control word identifies the algorithm (Page 38, paragraph 55).

Referring to claim 15, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as 3DES, DES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of a cryptographic unit executes a plurality of cryptographic rounds on each of a plurality of input text blocks to generate a corresponding each of a plurality of output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic rounds are prescribed by a control word that is provided to said cryptographic unit execution logic comprises of a plurality of output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic cryptography unit.

Referring to claim 16, Kessler discloses a co-processor that includes multiple execution units (Figure 2) wherein each of the execution units includes an execution queue to store cryptographic instructions received by the co-processor (Figure 8), which meets the limitation of a cryptographic unit within a microprocessor, configured to execute one of the cryptographic operations response to receipt of a cryptographic instruction that prescribes said one of the cryptographic operations, wherein said cryptographic instruction is one of the instructions in an application program that are fetched from memory by fetch logic in said microprocessor. The execution units include a plurality of operation blocks that correspond to different cryptographic operations that are used depending upon the type of instruction received in the execution queue (Figure 8 & Col. 9, lines 7-43), which meets the limitation of an algorithm field, configured to

prescribed one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms to be employed when executing said one of the cryptographic operations. Using the appropriate operation block, the corresponding cryptographic algorithm is used when processing the received instruction (Col. 9, lines 28-43), which meets the limitation of algorithm logic, disposed within said microprocessor and operatively coupled to said cryptography unit, configured to direct said microprocessor to perform said one of the cryptographic operations according to said one of the plurality of cryptographic algorithms. Kessler does not specify that the co-processor executes that program that includes the cryptographic operations. Colavin discloses a host and co-processor configuration wherein the co-processor executes the actual application program (Abstract & [0018]), which meets the limitation of wherein said microprocessor executes said application program to obtain expected results. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the co-processor of Kessler to execute the actual application program as described by Colavin in order to efficiently execute programs with high instruction level parallelism as taught by Colavin ([0002]). Kessler does not specify that the co-processor utilizes the x86 instruction set. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the co-processor described in Kessler to implement the x86 instruction set because the x86 instruction set has been widely accepted because of its compatibility with a large amount of software as taught by Miller (Col. 2, lines 9-14). Applicant's specification shows that integer instructions are inherent to the x86 instruction set (Page 27). Therefore, when implementing the x86 instruction set in the co-processor of Kessler, as previously described, the execution units would effectively operate as a "integer unit" as claimed.

Referring to claim 17, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms comprises the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) algorithm.

Referring to claim 18, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as DES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms comprises the Digital Encryption Standard (DES) algorithm.

Referring to claim 19, Kessler discloses that the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as 3DES (Figures 5 & 8), which meets the limitation of one of a plurality of cryptographic algorithms comprises the Triple-DES algorithm.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2132